

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/724,532	Applicant(s) REED, THOMAS D.	
	Examiner Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1653	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karen Cochrane Carlson, Ph.D.

(3) Amy Atzel

(2) Daniel Nesbitt

(4) Thomas Reed (inventor)

Date of Interview: 09 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kimura, 1997.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Please
Rescan
Do NOT Enter Again!

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn bec the term "isolated" is found preceeding the polypeptide. Regarding the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd para., Applicants will submit 2 sets of claims for Claims 15 and 16, one drawn to encoding nucleic acids and one to antisense nucleic acids. Claims 19 and 20 will be amended to depend from Claim 17. The rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 over the teachings of Kimura are withdrawn except for Claims 17 and 18. Kimura et al. do not teach or suggest to make at least 2 substitutions at the claimed amino acid residues. Claims 17 and 18 are not so limited. Applicants indicated that they may wish to add that the polypeptide is linked to a nonproteinaceous compound, bec fusion proteins of the claimed compound with selected mutations are taught/obvious over Kimura 1996, 1997 which teach epitope tags..